



Fulton Corridor Specific Plan
Community Advisory Committee

Meeting Location: Fresno City Hall, City Council Chambers, 2600 Fresno Street, Fresno, CA 93721

MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, November 1, 2011 – 3:06 p.m.

Commission Members Present:

Joyce Aiken, Alan Allen (Chair), Rosemarie Amaral, Nancy Ayala, Donavan Byrn, Raul De Alba, Morgan Doizaki, Victoria Gonzales, Nancy Marquez, Timothy Schulz, Cliff Tutelian, Maribel Vera-Anaya, Allysun Williams, Brent Weiner

Commission Alternates Present:

Jan Minami

Members Not Present:

James J. Connell, Evan Hammer, Jr., James Haron, Eric A. Kalkowski, Gary LanFranco, Roger Palomino, Polly Parenti,

Downtown and Community Revitalization Staff:

Craig Scharton, Assistant Director
Elliott Balch, Downtown Revitalization Manager
Wilma Quan, Urban Planning Specialist

Diana Asami, Recording Secretary

I. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Chair Alan Allen called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m. and called roll.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Agenda Approval

Chair Alan Allen called for approval of the meeting's agenda. A motion to approve the agenda was made by Joyce Aiken, seconded by Donavan Byrn; the motion was carried unanimously (m/s/c 14 yes, 0 no).

B. Approval of Minutes for October 25, 2010 Regular Meeting

Chair Alan Allen called for approval of minutes of the October 25, 2010 Regular Meeting.

A correction was made to the spelling of a name on page 3, paragraph second from the bottom, changing Elliott Balch's name from B-a-l-l to B-a-l-c-h. Also, Nancy Marquez

corrected the attendance record to reflect that she was present at the October 18, 2011 meeting, as she arrived after roll call. Additionally Maribel Vera-Anaya noted that she was not, in fact, present at the meeting as noted in the roll.

A motion to approve the minutes as corrected was made by Nancy Ayala, seconded by Allysun Williams; the motion was carried (m/s/c 13 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention).

III. REPORTS FROM GROUPS ON THE DRAFT FULTON CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN AND DRAFT DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CODE

Elliott Balch, City of Fresno, Downtown & Community Revitalization Division, commented that this was the third meeting held in the afternoon and the next meeting would be held at 5:30 p.m. He stated that to further the process of helping Committee members become comfortable with moving the Fulton Corridor Specific Plan along in its process, discussion groups had been formed during the past week to focus on different parts of the Plan, such as the central business district and the cultural arts area, and that during the group discussions, some Committee members had suggested that members of the public join the groups. He stated that one group had met to discuss the Civic Center, and a very small group of one had met to discuss the Downtown Development Code; and that just prior to this meeting, a group had met on issues concerning the central business district in the Mall area. He further stated that the focus of the groups was for stakeholders to ask questions, to distill their suggestions for possible action by the Committee and Staff. He urged anyone who had taken part in these group discussions to bring forward the topics discussed. He mentioned there had been one email concerning issues in Chinatown, though no meeting on Chinatown had yet been held, and after this meeting a possible group might take place on the cultural arts district.

Chair Alan Allen commented that, pursuant to discussions he had been having, these meetings should be limited to the defined Specific Plan area and that the Plan will be harder to change once approved by the Committee. Elliott Balch agreed, stating that it was preferable to work out issues known to exist now, rather than later in the process of developing the Plan and Code.

Chair Alan Allen opened the floor to discussion.

Jan Minami brought up a topic from a group discussion, consideration of a mandatory percentage of new development that would be spent on a development's art component, as is done in Portland. Joyce Aiken voiced her support of the suggestion and that the City should consider this for any new construction. Timothy Schulz asked for clarification of whether this was a budget for new art or to relocate or refurbish existing art; Jan Minami responded that in Portland, she believed one percent of all new development cost was applied to an art component. Chair Alan Allen suggested a possible caveat to the Plan that income generated from the parking fees from the additional parking spaces opened up on the Fulton Mall by Options 1 or 2 could be given to the art community.

IV. INPUT ON THE DRAFT FULTON CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN AND DRAFT DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CODE

A. Comments from the Committee Members

Chair Alan Allen stated that on page 4-16, Section 4.6, should be stated more precisely; that though it states that Option 1 was favored in votes on Fulton Mall's Options 1, 2 and 3, he feels it should indicate the actual, overwhelming percentage by which Option 1 was favored in those votes.

Victoria Gonzales stated her feeling that the Downtown Development Code and the Fulton Corridor Specific Plan was very thorough and had done what it set out to do; that it provided the things needed in downtown; that it simplifies the land use standards for people that want to invest in downtown; that the rules are easy to follow and are well spelled out; and that she felt the Committee should follow through on it. As far as the Fulton Corridor Specific Plan, she did not feel it had missed any subject; that although she had minor changes, overall, it was going in the right direction and got down to every point. She urged everyone to read the whole Plan. Her only comments were on the Traffic Signal Mitigation Impact, waiving the fees in the central business district, which she feels should be done in other districts as well, and the Parking Management Plan, which also should be expanded to other districts.

Jan Minami suggested that if a person did not want to read the entire Plan, they should focus on Sections 2.1, 2.3 and 3.1.

Joyce Aiken brought up Eaton Plaza, as discussed in the October 25, 2011 meeting, shown in Section 8.10 reduced to a minute area. She stated that in 1947 Fresno citizens voted by 71% to approve a bond issue to purchase the Eaton Plaza site, and in 2004 the Fresno City Council approved the Eaton Plaza Master Plan. She stated she would like to move that the Committee incorporate the Eaton Plaza Master Plan, as well as the schematic of Eaton Plaza, to become part of the record. Chair Alan Allen asked what the physical size of Eaton Plaza is compared to what was shown in 8.10. Joyce Aiken stated less than one-quarter of the plaza is shown in 8.10, as it actually goes all the way to Fresno Street. She added that it had been planned to make Eaton Plaza into a public park, and that there are almost no other green spaces in the downtown area.

Donavan Byrn seconded the Eaton Plaza motion by Joyce Aiken.

Chair Alan Allen asked for comment on the motion.

Cliff Tutelian stated his concern that, after review, the Plan as drawn took away the parking from the new Superior Court and the library, and did not provide for parking downtown. Victoria Gonzales stated that diagonal parking could be provided on the street or however it has been done elsewhere in other downtown areas. Cliff Tutelian stated that he agreed with the importance of green space in downtown and that he would support a version of the Plan that incorporated parking. He added that

at one time underground parking had been suggested, but the costs of one and the value of the other would need to be balanced. He would support a version of the motion subject to consideration of parking.

Jan Minami asked if there was an illustration of the Eaton Plaza Master Plan footprint in the Specific Plan. Joyce Aiken responded that Figure 8.10 only shows the small square of the amphitheater; that she did not find any further detail elsewhere in the Plan. Elliott Balch stated that on page 3.13 was an illustration that included Eaton Plaza showing buildings lining Mariposa.

Chair Alan Allen opened the floor to public comments.

B. Comments and questions from members of the public

Harold "Hal" Tokmakian has resided in Fresno and been involved in Fresno's downtown planning since 1958. He stated his involvement in city planning including Eaton Plaza, stating that at least four present in the audience had also been involved in the planning of Eaton Plaza. He commented that the Eaton Plaza Master Plan was not anywhere in the Specific Plan; that one illustration shows an entire block devoted to parking, one shows it as an amphitheater, and one shows it as a street lined with buildings. He stated that at one time it was discussed that public parking would be phased out; that there were going to be parking structures or underground parking, but no surface parking. He urged the Committee to accept the adopted Eaton Plaza Master Plan into the Specific Plan. He pointed out that Eaton Plaza was outside the Specific Plan.

Tom Bassett, a resident of the Tower District, voiced his doubt whether half of the Committee really knew what they were voting on when it came to Eaton Plaza. Joyce Aiken explained that in their discussion they were referring to a schematic drawing which the Committee was looking at.

Doug Richert pointed out that there was no spot on the agenda for motions such as the one proposed by Joyce Aiken regarding Eaton Plaza, and proposed delaying the making of the motion until next week to provide time for the members to research the subject. Chair Allen agreed that was a good idea, admitting this was the first time he had seen the Eaton Plaza plan.

Cliff Tutelian requested that during the following week the Staff distribute to Committee members copies of the Eaton Plaza Master Plan and the underground parking proposal, stating that green space and parking were equally important downtown; that downtown had suffered from a long-time lack of parking; that it was going to take many years for people not to expect to have available street parking, so the issue needed to be addressed.

James Oakes, a retired architect and planner, who had been involved in planning Eaton Plaza, stated that in the original plan there had been 800 parking spaces under Eaton Plaza. The Plan had been changed a number of times over the years. He stated that the City Council often adopted plans but then let them languish for 30 to 40 years and that he was bothered by the lack of continuity in the government of

Fresno and lack of respect for the efforts of those who had gone before. He stated his feeling that the Committee should be more informed on Eaton Plaza and its role in the core area, because long studies had gone into the preparation of the Eaton Plaza Master Plan. He added it was very difficult for the audience to hear the Committee members speaking.

Dixie Salazar, who has a studio downtown, voiced her desire to keep the green space of Eaton Plaza, stating that major cities all have green spaces and that Fresno needs more of them.

William Donleavey was born a few blocks from Eaton Plaza and attended school downtown. He was active in Junior Chamber of Commerce and involved in getting the bond passed to fund Eaton Plaza, which voters passed by 71%. Eaton Plaza was going to be a city park. The City Council had passed many plans since then. The federal government considered at one time building their new courthouse on the Eaton Plaza site, which was successfully opposed by the Fresno citizens. Over the years it had been shown many times that the Fresno population wants the water tower preserved and to have the block developed the way it was planned.

Chair Alan Allen asked whether Eaton Plaza was indeed located outside the Specific Plan area. Elliott Balch responded that Eaton Plaza was outside that area, but stated it had been included in the Plan because it was felt to be important to the community. Joyce Aiken asked how that would affect her motion to include the Eaton Plaza Master Plan. Elliott Balch stated that Eaton Plaza was also covered by the Community Plan, suggesting that the motion could request that the Community Plan include the Eaton Plaza Master Plan.

Bob Dwyer, a Fresno CPA and member of 1,000 Friends of Fresno, brought enlarged pictures of Eaton Plaza from "Neighbors" magazine for the Committee. He stated that Eaton Plaza took years to come to fruition, stating his amazement that in Fresno people could work so hard to accomplish a project and, within months of getting results, would have a new committee want to change it, voting on things they knew nothing about. He stated that this is what he feels is happening with Eaton Plaza and with the Fulton Mall. He added that the main customers of the Fulton Mall are those of mixed nationalities and are less than 50% Caucasian, so the Committee should be of that mix, too. Chair Alan Allen commented that all present were trying to do the same thing, simply voice their opinions.

Howard Tokmakian returned to state that the Committee should not get "hung up" on Eaton Plaza being outside of the area of the Specific Plan; that in his experience specific plan lines are arbitrary; that Eaton Plaza, the public library, etc., are all integral parts of downtown; that if the Committee thinks Eaton Plaza is an integral part, it should include it.

Elliott Balch stated that, regarding putting action over to next meeting, the Staff would be happy to get copies of the Eaton Plaza Master Plan. At Elliott Balch's suggestion, Chair Alan Allen tabled Joyce Aiken's prior motion about adding the Eaton Plaza Master Plan to the Fulton Corridor Specific Plan. Elliott Balch stated he will be glad to get something out before the next meeting.

Jan Minami suggested a list of items that will be voted on at next meeting be compiled, pointing out that there is a lot about the Eaton Plaza Master Plan on line.

Rosemarie Amaral asked if it was legitimate to make a motion about Eaton Plaza if it was outside of the area of the Specific Plan. Elliott Balch stated it was, that the areas around the Specific Plan were shown within the Plan because its surroundings were important.

Chair Alan Allen asked whether this issue should be tabled to be addressed at the next meeting. Jan Minami stated if the Eaton Plaza issue was tabled for next week, as well as the one percent art issue, the Committee would know they would be facing those issues at that meeting. Elliott Balch stated those exact motions do not have to be specifically stated on next week's agenda; that they can be made without being on the agenda, as well as other, new motions that cannot be anticipated.

Cliff Tutelian clarified that the Eaton Plaza Master Plan could in fact be able to be incorporated into the Specific Plan; Elliott Balch assured him that it could be.

Cliff Tutelian asked for suggestions from the Committee for materials needed to be provided from Staff to help them make an intelligent decision at the next week's meeting. The 1989 plan is the one he best recalled; that that one incorporated a plan for parking. He stated that though green space was important, parking was also very important in the development of downtown. In order to save time, Cliff requested the Staff provide the Committee members with a package of information allowing them to make an informed decision.

In response to a question by Morgan Doizaki, Elliott Balch stated that there was only going to be one EIR for the Specific Plan and the Community Plan, so that Eaton Plaza would definitely be included in the EIR. Morgan Doizaki then asked whether it was possible to have more than one alternative of the Eaton Plaza plan submitted. Elliott Balch stated it was.

Jan Minami commented that she could see that the Committee members were trying very hard to get everything done by the next week, but asked whether it was possible to have one more follow-up meeting. Chair Alan Allen outlined the main concern of the Committee now was to decide if the documents were good enough to move forward into the EIR process, and that there would be more small meetings over the future week to review the information the Staff was going to provide.

Cliff Tutelian stated that since many great minds had been involved in the 1989 Central Area Community Plan, if this Committee did not have the time or knowledge to come to a decision on Eaton Plaza, they should incorporate that 1989 Eaton Plaza Master Plan, which had been worked on for 40 or 50 years, into their Specific Plan, rather than leaving it out and compounding the problem, as it included both the parking and the park. Victoria Gonzales stated her belief that the 1989 version of the Eaton Plaza plan was actually different than the one being discussed.

Cliff Tutelian asked audience member Bob Dwyer whether the 1989 version of the water tower park included underground parking. Bob Dwyer stated he believes the

1989 version was the amendment that actually deleted the underground parking. He stated he does know that parking was a vital part of the original plan.

Cliff Tutelian suggested that that version of the Eaton Plaza plan that does incorporate parking be incorporated into the Specific Plan because that plan included both parking and the park; it would carry out the intent of the Eaton Plaza Master Plan. Bob Dwyer stated that that was the best recommendation he had heard from the Committee.

Elliott Balch suggested that for next week's meeting the plans should all be pulled together into a Staff recommendation, with steps to be taken as a committee. Joyce Aiken interjected that on October 1966 the Civic Center plan with parking garage beneath was approved unanimously by the City Council.

Eduardo Rodriguez, 24 years old, stated there were several parking garages around the Mall, but that many people nowadays were too lazy to walk even a quarter mile from the parking garages to the mall; however, people of his age group could not afford to buy cars and are looking to be more active, so they choose to get around on foot or by bicycle. He pointed out that the lofts downtown cater to those people who choose to walk from place to place; that when his friends go to San Francisco or Los Angeles, for example, they don't talk about how easy it was to park; they talk about how easy it was to catch a bus or take BART, or to walk. In his opinion, parking on the Mall is not the issue; it's managing the parking.

Tom Bassett stated he came to the meeting to discuss the Fulton Mall, but Eaton Plaza was all that was being discussed. He agrees that parking at Fulton Mall is a major issue. People can go to Fashion Fair and River Park and park for free. He added that there was also a snobbery issue in Fresno.

Morgan Doizaki stated that, per Section 9-4, there is plenty of parking downtown, with more parking coming in. Victoria Gonzales added that parking is addressed and well done; that it is really not an issue. She asked whether this meeting was really the time to deal with parking, Eaton Plaza, as it was out of the Specific Plan area, and issues such as that. Elliott Balch stated all comments were welcomed by the Staff and Committee to gauge how the stakeholders in the area felt about issues. Jan Minami commented the parking issue had two sides, an operational/management side and a philosophical side. The area had enough parking, but it was not well managed.

Elliott Balch suggested returning to part 4.A. of the agenda, for comments from the public on all subjects. Chair Alan Allen asked for public comment.

John D. McCubbin of Fresno High School area praised Cliff Tutelian's contribution to the City as wonderful. He stated that he had tried prepared for this meeting by reading the Plan, but the Plan on the website would not load on his personal computer; then had gone to the County library to find a copy on file, but the library did not have one. He suggested that the Staff lodge a copy in the Fresno libraries where it can be ready by those who are interested. Elliott Balch added that a copy was available in the City Clerk's office.

Mike Mancillas, a downtown resident, lived in downtown Fresno a few years ago, moved away, and has since returned. In the five to six years he was gone, hundreds of people and businesses had moved into the area where he used to live. Because of that, he felt that Option 3 was the best option for the Fulton Corridor Specific Plan. He suggested the Committee take a more conservative attitude and allow private enterprise fill in the area, as it had been doing; that capital be used to restore the Mall, not to tear it out. He commented that no one knew what effect the high-speed rail system was going to have on the area; that once the high speed rail was in place, the area could well have to be redone, no matter whatever option had acted upon. He further mentioned he was against the artwork proposal.

Ray McKnight, 2607 North Seashell, Fresno, stated that Option 3 is the right choice for the Fulton Mall. He stated that on August 20, 2010, the Fulton Mall was "determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places . . . in the areas of landscape, architecture, community planning and development, recreation, entertainment and social history"; that the Fulton Mall is a nationally recognized sample of modern urban design, and that discussions and photographs of the Fulton Mall can be found in books published as recently as 2004. He commented that if Options 1 or 2 are chosen and the Fulton Mall is destroyed, Fresno can no longer promote it. He then asked the question, why spend a great deal of money for uncertain results, the unrealistic pipedream of becoming a major retail center downtown, stating that Fulton Mall will never be a major retail center, even if traffic can once again drive through its streets.

Jensen Vang of the Fresno County Economic Opportunity Commission told of the Commission receiving a grant in 2009 to start a farmer's market on the mall. Within five months of starting, in 2009, the farmer's market was generating \$100,000 in sales, without buildings and with no parking issues. In 2010 it generated \$88,000 in sales. It only generated \$50,000 of sales in 2011, due to layoffs and the decrease in vendors. Some of the farmer's market sales were to food stamp customers. He further made the point that the agriculture community drives the economy in Fresno. Lastly, he commented that the Hmong community looks for a corridor or area that they can develop and the development of this area could cause an influx of the Hmong community.

Chair Alan Allen asked whether the draft at the Clerk's office was something that could be checked out. Elliott Balch responded that, unfortunately, there was only one copy at the Clerk's Office that could be reviewed at a table in the office, but that he was currently dealing with Valprint, a local printing company, to make copies available so that, at people's request, Valprint would print them a copy of the Plan; that that arrangement should be up and running by November 2, 2011. John McCubbin asked how much a copy from Valprint would cost. Elliott Balch responded that Valprint would do it for less than \$50, to which Mr. McCubbin commented that that was a heavy cost for citizen participation.

Joyce Aiken asked whether there were going to be other motions added to the two noted, regarding Eaton Plaza and the art development. Elliott Balch stated it was his intention to list the motions on the next meeting's agenda as "items for potential

discussion.” He further noted that now was the time for Committee members to ask for material needed for discovery.

Sue McCline, 1516 W. Escalon, Fresno, CA, who was born and raised in Fresno, suggested the Committee think of the Fulton Mall like a Roeding Park because retail has changed; so many people, including herself, buy on line now. She further noted that at the three meetings of the Committee that she has attended, she has heard members of the public only voice support for Option 3.

Chair Alan Allen asked for further public comments; there were none. He opened the floor to the Committee members.

Morgan Doizaki asked that Committee members be informed of when the small subgroup meetings would be held. Elliott Balch commented he had sent emails to members; that those people organized the times the meetings were held; that any Committee members or members of the public interested in attended the meetings should see him at the end of this meeting if they wanted to be informed of the other meetings.

Craig Scharton stated that the FCSPCAC meetings had been publicly noticed and advertised meetings; that a certain amount of time had been budgeted with the consultants for the meetings; that it was critical the Committee make every effort to wrap up the process at the next meeting because to stretch to one more meeting would take several thousand addition dollars that were not budgeted, though, if absolutely necessary, they could find a way to do it. He further urged the Committee that at that next meeting the members take as long as was necessary to finish the process, encouraging them not to put anything on their calendars for next Tuesday to ensure the meeting not lose quorum; and made his strongest recommendation that the Committee be ready to finish up at that meeting and put the process into motion.

Chair Alan Allen asked whether there was anyone on the Committee that had strong reservations currently and felt a lot more time was going to be needed. Timothy Schultz responded that the public would increasingly become aware that each Committee member was only so educated in the Development Code and Specific Plan they were voting on; that he has concerns and is not entirely comfortable putting the process in motion because he is not well versed in each document.

Jan Minami asked all Committee members to decide what education needed to be done before the next meeting, because they would be asked to vote at the meeting next Tuesday; that now was the time for anyone not comfortable to ask for more information. Elliott Balch stated that the requests for information on the art proposal was a bit open ended, but that he would be happy to provide any specific requests for information. Morgan Doizaki asked what items were on next week’s agenda for a vote; Joyce Aiken responded she believed so far there were only two requested for vote at the next meeting. Elliott Balch stated he had not heard an actual motion on

the public art issue, just on Eaton Plaza, and added that there may well be others brought up at that meeting.

Chair Alan Allen voiced his strong support of the documents, feeling that they were indeed ready to be moved along in the EIR process.

Timothy Schultz stated his concerns about a question at last week's meeting by Howard Tokmakian about whether the Development Code and Specific Plan were going to be passed by City Council by ordinance or resolution; he asked if it were true that when passed by ordinance, there was far less, if any, room for change should the need arise. Elliott Balch responded that, technically, it was actually possible to amend what is passed by either resolution or ordinance. He further stated that, philosophically, if concerns were such that a Committee member was looking to amend the Plan down the road, it was best to fix the Plan now. Timothy Schultz stated he was really looking for more input from those more knowledgeable to understand what he was voting on, especially regarding the Form-Based Codes, which were new to Fresno, to understand what he was voting into place.

Elliott Balch stated that at 4:00 p.m. the day before, a meeting was called, to which was received a few responses, but only one attendee. Another meeting could be scheduled. He stated exercises could be done of meeting at a property site and walking through the site while referring to the Code, which had been done several times in the past; that the place to start was to sit down and look at the Plan. Nancy Ayala commented that she would like to attend, but was unavailable on Wednesday until after 8:00 p.m. Elliott Balch stated that they could hold a subcommittee of one, if necessary. Craig Scharon has time to meet on Friday from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. or on Saturday, from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m., as long as no quorum was present; Elliott Balch is available at both of those times as well.

Chair Alan Allen stated that he has attended every meeting and every charrettes, and has a very high comfort level with the Plan and the Code.

Victoria Gonzales made a motion to adjourn.

Cliff Tutelian requested a change in Section 6.7.1 of the Civic Center District, the southern boundary from Kern Street to Inyo; because between "L" and "M" streets is a high rise building occupied predominantly by government tenants; on "M" Street is the Convention Center; and between "N" and "P" streets are buildings occupied by government entities and parking lots which potentially could be future government locations and public parking. Elliott Balch stated that, at a minimum, the comment was noted. He commented that that change would have other implications, such as changing other district maps in coordination with that change.

Chair Alan Allen opened the floor to Unscheduled Communications.

V. UNSCHEDULED COMMUNICATIONS

A. Remarks from members of the public

Doug Richert stated that if the City was going to have a problem coming up with money for another meeting, where is the money going to come from to tear up the Fulton Mall. He further commented that, since all commented received have been from those in support of Option 3, if those people in support of Options 1 and 2 would not come down to City Hall to the meetings, they probably would not come down to buy anything.

B. Remarks from Committee members

Cliff Tutelian responded that people felt a lot of frustration, particularly with the vacancy; that the City needs to attract people, retailers in particular, and find a way to fill in the Fulton Mall; that it would take flexibility; that the money comes from good faith that there is a plan in place that will work. He stated that this is a good plan that, for the first time ever, is more public friendly and user friendly than ever. Doug Richert responded that he did not disagree with the Plan, but was simply commenting that Option 3 was the way to go because it had the greatest chance of success in the current economic times. Cliff Tutelian stated that if spending \$8 million would generate revenue and create jobs, more than a plan that cost twice as much, sometimes the key to success is to satisfy the needs of the community. He further stated that Options 1 and 2 have things for everybody, whereas Option 3 does not. Doug Richert replied that he does not support Option 3 for the stagnant purpose of keeping things the same, but feels that Options 1 and 2 are not economically feasible, as the Mall is not close to their target demographics.

Maribel Vera-Anaya seconded the motion made earlier by Victoria Gonzales to adjourn the meeting; it was passed unanimously passed (m/s/c/ 14 yes, 0 no).

V. NEXT MEETING

Though not announced, the next meeting will be held on November 8, 2011 at 5:00 p.m.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Alan Allen adjourned the meeting at 5:17 p.m.